arXiv:1605.06271v3 [math.LO] 29 Jan 2017

THE TREE PROPERTY UP TO $\aleph_{\omega^2}$

YAIR HAYUT

Abstract. Starting from a stationary set of supercompact cardinals we find a generic extension in which the tree property holds at every regular cardinal between $\aleph_2$ and $\aleph_{\omega^2}$.

1. introduction

Definition 1. A partial order $\leq_T$ on a set X is called a *tree* if for every $x \in X$, $\{y \mid y \leq_T x\}$ is well ordered by $\leq_T$ and $\leq_T$ has a minimal element.

For a given tree $T = \langle X, \leq_T \rangle$, the α^{th} level of T, $\mathrm{Lev}_\alpha(T)$, is the set of all $x \in X$ such that $\mathrm{otp}\langle\{y \mid y <_T x\}, \leq_T\rangle = \alpha$. When there is no risk of confusion, we will use the notation $T_\alpha = \mathrm{Lev}_\alpha(T)$. The height of the tree T is the minimal ordinal γ such that $\mathrm{Lev}_\gamma(T) = \emptyset$.

Definition 2. For a cardinal κ, a tree T is called a κ-tree if it has height κ and for every $\alpha < \kappa$, $|\mathrm{Lev}_\alpha(T)| < \kappa$.

T is κ-Aronszajn tree, if it is a κ-tree and it has no cofinal branch. We say that the *tree property* holds at κ if there are no κ-Aronszajn trees.

The following question, due to Magidor, is the main open problem related to the tree property:

Question 1. Is it consistent, relative to large cardinals, that the tree property holds at every regular cardinal $\geq \aleph_2$?

For the history of the problem, see [6]. The best known result in this area is due to Unger, [9]. In this paper, Unger constructs a model in which the tree property holds in every successor cardinal between $\aleph_2$ and $\aleph_{\omega\cdot 2}$. Unger's construction improves the previous result, by Neeman, [6].

In Neeman's model, $\aleph_\omega$ is strong limit. When trying to extend his result (and maintaining the same cardinal arithmetic structure), one encounters the following open problem:

Question 2. Is it consistent that $\aleph_\omega$ is strong limit and the tree property holds at both $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ and $\aleph_{\omega+2}$?

Even the simpler question (due to Woodin) – whether it is consistent that the tree property holds at $\aleph_{\omega+1}$ and $\neg\mathrm{SCH}_{\aleph_\omega}$, is completely open. We remark that if one replaces $\aleph_\omega$ by $\aleph_{\omega^2}$ in those questions, the answer is known to be positive by a recent result of Unger and Sinapova, [10].

In Unger's model, $\aleph_\omega$ is not a strong limit, and thus the problem mentioned above is avoided.

In this paper, we follow Unger's paper and obtain the consistency of the tree property at every regular cardinal in the range $[\aleph_2, \aleph_{\omega^2})$, relative to large cardinals.

The main obstacle towards this result is getting the tree property at many successors of singular cardinals simultaneously. We overcome this problem by using

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E35, 03E55.
Key words and phrases. tree property, large cardinals.

a trick, similar to the one in [2], that enables us to find a single cardinal which reflects simultaneously infinitely many singular cardinals.

Our notations are mostly standard. For basic facts about forcing and large cardinals we refer the reader to [3]. We force downwards and our forcing notions are always separative, namely $p \leq q$ implies that p is stronger than q and forces that q is in the generic filter. We will assume that all our forcing notions have an unique maximal (i.e. weakest) element. For a forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ we will denote by $1_{\mathbb{P}}$ this maximal element. When $\mathbb{P}$ is clear from the context, we will drop the subscript.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Definition 3. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a forcing notion.

(1) $\mathbb{P}$ is μ-closed if for every $\rho < \mu$ and every decreasing sequence of conditions $\langle p_i \mid i < \rho \rangle$, $(i < j \implies p_j \leq p_i)$ there is a lower bound, namely a condition $p \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $\forall i < \rho$, $p \leq p_i$.
(2) $\mathbb{P}$ is canonically μ-closed if for every $\rho < \mu$ and for every decreasing sequence of conditions $\langle p_i \mid i < \rho \rangle$, there is a unique maximal lower bound, namely a condition $p \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $\forall i < \rho$, $p \leq p_i$ and for every lower bound p', $p' \leq p$.
(3) $\mathbb{P}$ is μ-directed closed if every set $F \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ of pairwise compatible conditions, $|F| < \mu$, has a lower bound, namely a condition $p \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $\forall q \in F$, $p \leq q$.
(4) $\mathbb{P}$ is canonically μ-directed closed if every set $F \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ of pairwise compatible conditions, $|F| < \mu$, has an unique infimum.

During the proof of the main theorem, we will need to know that certain projections preserve lower bounds and infimums. We will use the following (partially nonstandard) terminology:

Definition 4. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a forcing notion and assume that $\iota \colon \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{Q}$ is an order preserving map, $\iota(1_{\mathbb{P}}) = 1_{\mathbb{Q}}$. We say that ι is a projection if for every $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $\{\iota(q) \mid q \leq p\}$ is dense below $\iota(p)$.

We say that a projection ι is *continuous* if for every set of conditions $A \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, if p is the infimum of A then $\iota(p)$ is the infimum of $\iota \, " \, A$.

If $\iota \colon \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{Q}$ is a projection then any generic filter $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ generates a generic filter for $\mathbb{Q}$ by $H = \{q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid \exists p \in G, \iota(p) \leq q\}$. On the other hand, if H is a generic filter for $\mathbb{Q}$ then the *quotient forcing* $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{P}/H = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid \exists q \in H \mid q \leq \iota(p)\}$ has the property $\mathbb{Q} * \mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{P}$. We will use also the notation $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{P}/\mathbb{Q}$ where we do not specify a generic filter for $\mathbb{Q}$. It should be read as the canonical name for the forcing $\mathbb{P}/\dot{H}$ where $\dot{H}$ is the canonical name for the generic filter $\dot{H} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$.

Lemma 5. *Let $\iota \colon \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{Q}$ be a continuous projection and assume that $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ are canonically κ-closed. Let $H \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ be a generic filter. Let $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{P}/H$ be the quotient forcing. Then $\mathbb{R}$ is canonically κ-closed in $V[H]$.*

Proof. Let $\langle \dot{r}_i \mid i < \zeta \rangle$ be a sequence of names for conditions in $\mathbb{R}$, where $\Vdash i < j \implies \dot{r}_j < \dot{r}_i$ and $\zeta < \kappa$. Let q be a condition in $\mathbb{Q}$.

Pick, by induction on $i \leq \zeta$, a decreasing sequence of conditions $q_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $q_0 \leq q$, $q_i \Vdash \dot{r}_i = \check{p}_i$ for some $p_i \in \mathbb{P}$. Assume that we have defined the sequence for all $i < i_\star$.

Since $q_i \Vdash \check{p}_i \in \mathbb{R}$, by the definition of the quotient forcing, $q_i \leq \iota(p_i)$. Since the sequence $\langle p_i \mid i < i_\star \rangle$ is decreasing in $\mathbb{P}$ it has a maximal lower bound, $p'_{i_\star}$. Similarly, since $\langle q_i \mid i < i_\star \rangle$ is decreasing, it also has a maximal lower bound, $q'_{i_\star}$. By the continuity of ι, $\iota(p'_{i_\star})$ is the maximal lower bound of $\langle \iota(p_i) \mid i < i_\star \rangle$. Since

$q'_{i_\star}$ is a lower bound for the sequence $\langle q_i \mid i < i_\star\rangle$, it is also a lower bound of the sequence $\langle \iota(p_i) \mid i < i_\star\rangle$ and by the maximality of $\iota(p'_{i_\star})$, $\iota(p'_{i_\star}) \geq q'_{i_\star}$. Thus, $q'_{i_\star} \Vdash \check{p}'_{i_\star} \in \mathbb{R}$. Clearly, $p_{i_\star}$ is a maximal lower bound for $\langle \dot{r}_i \mid i < i_\star\rangle$ and therefore $q'_{i_\star} \Vdash \dot{r}_{i_\star} \leq \check{p}'_{i_\star}$. We may extend $q'_{i_\star}$ to $q_{i_\star}$ that decides the value of $\dot{r}_{i_\star}$ to be some $p_{i_\star}$.

At the end of the process, we have conditions q'_ζ and p'_ζ such that $q'_\zeta \Vdash \check{p}'_\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q'_\zeta \Vdash \forall i < \check{\zeta}, \dot{r}_i \geq \check{p}'_\zeta$.

□

Throughout the paper, we will use arguments for properties of forcing notions that are true since they hold in some larger generic extension. We will use the following terminology:

Definition 6. A forcing $\mathbb{P}$ is *subsumed* by a forcing $\mathbb{Q}$ if there is a projection from $\mathbb{Q}$ onto $\mathbb{P}$.

Lemma 7. *Assume that T is a tree in V and assume that $\mathbb{P}$ adds a new branch to T. Then in any generic extension of V, $\mathbb{P}$ adds a new branch to T.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathbb{Q} \in V$ is a forcing notion. Forcing with $\mathbb{Q} * \mathbb{P}$ is the same as forcing with $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q}$. Let $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ and $H \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ be two mutually generic filters. Then $V[G] \cap V[H] = V$. Let $\dot{b}$ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name for a new branch in T. Then $\dot{b}^G \in V[G]$ and $\dot{b}^G \notin V$ and therefore $\dot{b}^G \notin V[H]$. □

The following preservation lemma, due to Unger, is used during the proof of the tree property at successors of singular cardinals ([9, Lemma 5.5])

Lemma 8. *Let $\mu < \nu$ be singular cardinals of countable cofinality. Let $\kappa < \nu$ be regular and let $\langle \mu_n \mid n < \omega\rangle$ be a cofinal sequence of regular cardinals below μ.*

Let:

1. $\mathbb{P} = \mathrm{Add}(\omega, \kappa)$.
2. *$\mathbb{Q}$ a forcing notion, which is subsumed by $\mathbb{Q}'$ which is σ-closed and for every n, $\mathbb{Q}' \cong \mathbb{Q}_n \times \mathbb{Q}^n$, $\mathbb{Q}_n$ is μ_n-c.c. and $\mathbb{Q}^n$ is μ_n-closed.*
3. $\mathbb{E} = \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \mu)$.
4. *$\mathbb{R}$ is μ^+-closed.*

Assume that $|\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{E}|^\mu < \nu$ and assume that T is a ν^+-tree in the generic extension by $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{E}$. Then, $\mathbb{R}$ cannot add a new branch to T.

We will use Lemma 7 repeatedly when showing that a certain forcing notion cannot add a branch to a certain tree. In those cases, it will be easier to show that a new branch cannot be added to the tree by this forcing in some larger model (in which there might be many other new branches to this tree), and then conclude that this new branch could not be added to the ground model as well.

2.1. **Preservation Lemmas.** The following lemma is due to Unger, [8, Lemma 2.4].

Lemma 9. *Let κ be regular cardinal. Let T be a tree of height κ and let $\mathbb{P}$ be a forcing notion. If $\mathbb{P}$ adds a new cofinal branch to T then $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P}$ is not κ-c.c. In particular, κ-Knaster forcing cannot add a branch to a κ-tree.*

Proof. Let T be a tree of height κ and let $\dot{b}$ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name for a new cofinal branch in T. Let us define, by induction, an antichain of size κ in $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P}$.

Let γ be an ordinal below κ. Assume that we have defined a sequence of conditions $\{\langle q_i, q'_i\rangle \mid i < \gamma\}$ and an increasing sequence of ordinals $\{\alpha_i \mid i < \gamma\}$. Let us define $\alpha_\gamma, \langle q_\gamma, q'_\gamma\rangle$.

Let α be $\sup\{\alpha_i \mid i < \gamma\} + 1$. Since $\dot{b}$ is cofinal, there is a condition $p_\gamma \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $p_\gamma \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \dot{b}(\alpha) = \check{t}_\gamma$, for some $t_\gamma \in T_\alpha$. Since $\dot{b}$ is new, there are conditions $q_\gamma, q'_\gamma \leq p_\gamma$ and ordinal $\alpha_\gamma \in (\alpha, \kappa)$ such that $q_\gamma \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \dot{b}(\gamma) = \check{s}_\gamma$, $q'_\gamma \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \dot{b}(\gamma) = \check{s}'_\gamma$ and $s_\gamma \neq s'_\gamma$.

Pick $\gamma < \gamma'$. If s_γ is incompatible with $s_{\gamma'}$ then q_γ is incompatible with $q_{\gamma'}$ (since they force different values for $\dot{b}(\alpha_\gamma)$). Otherwise, $q'_{\gamma'}$ forces $\dot{b}(\alpha_\gamma) = s_\gamma$, since it forces the same value as $q_{\gamma'}$ on all values of $\dot{b}(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \leq \sup_{\delta<\gamma'} \alpha_\delta$. In particular, it is incompatible with $q'_{\gamma'}$. □

Lemma 9 does not assume anything about the width of the tree. Therefore, we can conclude the following generalization immediately: for every ordinal α, if T is a tree of height α, and $\mathbb{P}$ is a forcing notion such that $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P}$ is $\operatorname{cf}\alpha$-c.c. then $\mathbb{P}$ does not add a cofinal branch to T.

The following definition, due to Magidor and Shelah, is very useful for analysing how forcing notions interact with the tree property, especially at successors of singular cardinals.

Definition 10. [4] Let λ be a regular cardinal. A triple $\mathcal{S} = \langle I, \mathcal{R}, \kappa\rangle$ is called a *narrow system of height* λ if:

1. $I \subseteq \lambda$, $\sup I = \lambda$.
2. $\mathcal{R}$ is a set of relations, where $R \in \mathcal{R}$ is a partial order on $I \times \kappa$, and if $\langle\alpha,\zeta\rangle R \langle\beta,\xi\rangle$ then $\alpha < \beta$ or $\alpha = \beta \wedge \zeta = \xi$. Moreover, if $\langle\alpha,\zeta\rangle R\langle\gamma,\tau\rangle$ and $\langle\beta,\xi\rangle R\langle\gamma,\tau\rangle$ then $\langle\alpha,\zeta\rangle$ and $\langle\beta,\xi\rangle$ are compatible.
3. For every $\alpha < \beta$ in I, there is $R \in \mathcal{R}$ and $\zeta, \xi < \kappa$ such that $\langle\alpha,\zeta\rangle R\langle\beta,\xi\rangle$.
4. $|\mathcal{R}|^+, \kappa^+ < \lambda$.

A set $b \subseteq I \times R$ is called a *branch* if it is an R-chain for some $R \in \mathcal{R}$. As in the tree case, we will denote by $b(\alpha)$ the unique ordinal $\zeta < \kappa$ such that $\langle\alpha,\zeta\rangle \in b$, if there is one. $\operatorname{dom} b$ is the set of all α such that $b(\alpha)$ is defined. b is *cofinal* if $\sup \operatorname{dom} b = \lambda$. A system of branches, $\{b_j \mid j \in J\}$ is a set of branches such that $\bigcup \operatorname{dom} b_j = I$. The *width* of the system of branches is $|J|$.

λ has the *narrow system property* if every narrow system has a cofinal branch.

The following lemma is due to Sinapova, [7].

Lemma 11. *Let $\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q}$ be forcing notions, $\mathbb{P}$ is κ-c.c. and $\mathbb{Q}$ is κ-closed. Assume that $\mathcal{S} \in V^{\mathbb{P}}$ is a narrow system of width $< \kappa$ and assume that $\mathcal{S}$ has a system of branches in $V^{\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{Q}}$ of width $< \kappa$. Then $\mathcal{S}$ has a cofinal branch in $V^{\mathbb{Q}}$ as well.*

We remark that the proof of Lemma 9 also give us that if $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P}$ is κ-c.c. then $\mathbb{P}$ cannot add cofinal branches to narrow systems of height κ.

In the proof of the tree property at double successor cardinals we will need the following preservation lemma.

Lemma 12 (Unger)**.** *Let κ be a regular cardinal. Let $\rho \leq \mu \leq \kappa$ be cardinals such that $2^\rho \geq \kappa$, $2^{<\rho} < \mu$. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be μ-c.c. forcing notion and let $\mathbb{Q}$ be μ-closed forcing notion in the ground model.*

Let T be a κ-tree in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$. Then $\mathbb{Q}$ does not add new branches to T.

Proof. Let T be a κ-tree in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$ and let $\dot{b}$ be a name for a new branch.

Let us construct by induction a tree of conditions $\langle q_\eta \mid \eta \in {}^{\leq\rho}2\rangle$ in $\mathbb{Q}$, and a sequence of ordinals $\xi_\alpha < \kappa$ such that:

1. If $\eta \neq \eta'$ and $\operatorname{len}(\eta) = \operatorname{len}(\eta') = \alpha$ then $1 \Vdash$"$\check{q}_\eta, \check{q}_{\eta'}$ force different values for $\dot{b}$ at level $\check{\xi}_\alpha$".
2. For limit ordinal α, if $\operatorname{len}\eta = \alpha$, q_η is the infimum of $\langle q_{\eta\restriction\beta} \mid \beta < \alpha\rangle$.

Claim 13. *Let $\mathbb{R}$ be a μ-closed forcing. Let $\dot{D}$ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name for a dense open set in $\mathbb{R}$ and let $q \in \mathbb{R}$. There is $q' \leq q$ such that $1_{\mathbb{P}} \Vdash \check{q}' \in \dot{D}$.*

Proof. Let us construct, by induction, a decreasing sequence of conditions in $\mathbb{R}$, $\langle q_i \mid i < \zeta \rangle$ and a sequence of incompatible conditions $\langle p_i \mid i < \zeta \rangle$ such that $\forall j < i$, $p_i \Vdash \check{q}_j \notin \dot{D}$ and $p_i \Vdash \check{q}_i \in \dot{D}$. Using the chain condition of $\mathbb{P}$, we will conclude that $\zeta < \mu$ and therefore there is a lower bound q_ζ which will satisfy the requirements of the lemma.

Let $q_{-1} = q$.

Assume that we have defined $\langle p_i \mid i < \xi \rangle, \langle q_i \mid i < \xi \rangle$ and let $q'_\xi \leq q_i$ for all $i < \xi$ (this is possible by the discussion above, as $\xi < \mu$). If there is $p'_\xi \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $p'_\xi \Vdash \check{q}'_\xi \notin \dot{D}$ let us take $p_\xi \leq p'_\xi$ and $q_\xi \leq q'_\xi$ such that $p_\xi \Vdash q_\xi \in \dot{D}$. Note that indeed for all $i < j$, $p_i \perp p_j$ since they disagree on the truth value of the statement $q_i \in \dot{D}$. If there is no such condition $p \in \mathbb{P}$ we halt.

By the chain condition of $\mathbb{P}$, the process halts after less than κ steps. Let ζ be the length of the process. As we remarked at the beginning, the condition $q_\zeta = \inf_{i<\zeta} q_i$ satisfies the property that for every condition $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $p \Vdash q_\zeta \in \dot{D}$. □

Let us show that we can carry out the induction.

For limit ordinal $\alpha \leq \rho$, the choice of q_η for $\eta \in {}^{\alpha}2$ is completely determined by the values of $q_{\eta\restriction\gamma}$ for $\gamma < \alpha$.

Let $\alpha = \beta + 1$. For every $\eta \in {}^{\beta}2$, apply the Claim 13 for $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}$ and $\dot{D}$ the dense open set of pairs of elements that force contradictory information about the branch $\dot{b}$. Thus, below the condition (q_η, q_η) there is pair of conditions $(q_{\eta^\frown\langle 0\rangle}, q_{\eta^\frown\langle 1\rangle})$ which is forced to be in $\dot{D}$. By the chain condition of $\mathbb{P}$, we can find an ordinal $\delta_\eta < \kappa$ such that every condition in $\mathbb{P}$ forces that the pair $(q_{\eta^\frown\langle 0\rangle}, q_{\eta^\frown\langle 1\rangle})$ forces contradictory information below δ_η.

Take $\xi_\alpha = \sup_{\eta \in {}^{\beta}2} \delta_\eta$ to be the supremum of all ordinals that we dealt with during the definition of q_α and q_η, $\eta \in {}^{\alpha}2$. $\xi_\alpha < \kappa$ since κ is regular and $2^\beta \leq 2^{<\rho} < \kappa$.

In the end of this construction, we have a tree of at least κ many conditions $\langle q_\eta \mid \eta \in {}^{\rho}2 \rangle$ and an ordinal $\xi = \sup_{\beta<\rho} \xi_\beta < \kappa$. For every $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and each pair $\eta \neq \eta'$ and extensions $r \leq q_\eta, r' \leq q_{\eta'}$, if $(p, r) \Vdash \dot{b}(\xi) = \gamma$ and $(p, r') \Vdash \dot{b}(\xi) = \gamma'$, then $\gamma \neq \gamma'$. But, this is impossible, as T is a κ-tree and $2^\rho \geq \kappa$ in the generic extension by $\mathbb{P}$. □

We will need one more, similar, lemma due to Unger, [9, Lemma 5.3]

Lemma 14. *Let ν be a singular cardinal of cofinality ω. Assume that $\mathbb{P}$ is χ-c.c. forcing notion, $\mathbb{Q}$ is χ-closed and $|\mathbb{P}|^{<\chi} < \nu$.*

Let T be a ν^+-Aronszajn tree in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$. Then $\mathbb{Q}$ does not add branches to T.

2.2. **Termspace Forcing.** The concept of termspace forcing was introduced by Mitchell in [5].

Definition 15. Let $\mathbb{A}$ a forcing notion and let $\mathbb{B}$ be an $\mathbb{A}$-name for a forcing notion. The termspace forcing for $\mathbb{B}$ is the separative quotient of the class of all names τ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{A}} \tau \in \mathbb{B}$, ordered by $\tau \leq \sigma$ iff $\Vdash_{\mathbb{A}} \tau \leq_{\mathbb{B}} \sigma$. We denote the termspace forcing by $\mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{B}}_{\mathbb{A}}$.

Lemma 16. *There is a continuous projection from $\mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{B}}_{\mathbb{A}}$ onto $\mathbb{A} * \mathbb{B}$ given by the identity function.*

This projection allows us to analyse certain properties of the iteration by switching the order of its components.

Lemma 17. *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a forcing notion and let $\mathbb{B}$ be an $\mathbb{A}$-name for a forcing notion. Assume that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{A}} \mathbb{B}$ is μ-closed. Then $T^{\mathbb{B}}_{\mathbb{A}}$ is μ-closed. The same holds for μ-directed closed and for canonically μ-directed closed forcing .*

During the proof we would like to apply the mechanism of the termspace forcing on the iteration of more than two components, and get a product of forcing notions that projects naturally onto the iteration:

Definition 18. Let $\langle \mathbb{A}_\rho, \mathbb{B}_\zeta \mid \rho \leq \zeta_\star, \zeta < \zeta_\star \rangle$ be an iteration, with support in the ideal I on $\zeta_\star$. Let $\mathbb{T}_\zeta$ be the class of all $\mathbb{A}_\zeta$-names for members in $\mathbb{B}_\zeta$, ordered by $\tau \leq_{\mathbb{T}_\zeta} \sigma$ iff $\Vdash_{\mathbb{A}_\zeta} \tau \leq_{\mathbb{B}_\zeta} \sigma$.

Let $\mathbb{T}$ be the product of the components $\mathbb{T}_\zeta$, with respect to the ideal I.

As before, we take the separative quotient of $\mathbb{T}_i$, and use Scott's trick in order to formally treat $\mathbb{T}_i$ as sets.

There is a continuous projection from $\mathbb{T}$ to $\mathbb{A}_{\zeta_\star}$, given by evaluation. We call the forcing notions $\mathbb{T}_i$ which were generated from $\mathbb{B}_i$, the *iterated termspace forcings*.

3. Main Theorem

3.1. **Definition of the forcing.** Let $\delta^\star$ be a regular cardinal and let us assume that the set of all $\delta^\star$-supercompact cardinals below $\delta^\star$ is stationary. Let us fix an universal Laver function f such that $f(\alpha) = \emptyset$ for all non measurable α. Namely, for every $\delta^\star$-supercompact cardinal κ, every $\lambda \geq \kappa$ regular and every $x \in H(\lambda)$ there is a normal measure on $P_\kappa\lambda, \mathcal{U}$, such that $j_{\mathcal{U}}(f)(\kappa) = x$.

Let us force with the Laver preparation. In the generic extension, every $\delta^\star$-supercompact cardinal κ is indestructible under κ-directed closed forcing notions of cardinality $< \delta^\star$. We may assume that $f(\kappa) = \emptyset$ for every $\delta^\star$-supercompact κ, so the preperation forcing is trivial at supercompact levels. The function f defines a Laver function in the generic extension (by evaluation of names), and we will name it f as well. We will assume that f is *indestructible Laver function*, namely that for every $\delta^\star$-supercompact κ, and every κ-closed forcing of cardinality $< \delta'$, $\mathbb{P}$, if $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is a generic filter then f defines a Laver function in the generic extension by $\tilde{f}(\alpha) = f(\alpha)^G$ if $f(\alpha)$ is a $\mathbb{P}$-name and otherwise $\tilde{f}(\alpha) = \emptyset$.

Let us work in the generic extension by Laver's preparation.

Let us denote by $\mathrm{sc}_\alpha(\kappa)$ the first ordinal $\lambda \geq \kappa$ such that

$$\mathrm{otp}\{\beta \mid \kappa < \beta \leq \lambda,\ \beta \text{ is } {<}\delta^\star\text{-supercompact}\} = \alpha.$$

From this point until the very end of the proof, we will work inside $V_{\delta^\star}$. Thus, we will not distinguish between supercompact cardinals and $<\delta^\star$-supercompact cardinals.

Let $\vec{\eta} = \langle \kappa_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ be an increasing sequence of cardinals such that $\kappa_{n+1} > \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa_n)$ for all n, and let $\rho = \kappa_0$. Let us define a forcing notion, $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}^{\vec{\eta}}$, which depends on the choice of $\vec{\eta}$. We will show later that there is a choice of $\vec{\eta}$ for which $\mathbb{P}^{\vec{\eta}}$ forces the tree property at every regular cardinal in the interval $[\aleph_2, \aleph_{\omega^2})$.

We will assume always that κ_n is supercompact for all $1 \leq n < \omega$, and that ρ is strong limit singular cardinal of cofinality ω with unbounded set of Mahlo cardinals below ρ which are closed under f (namely that for every $\alpha < \rho$, there is a Mahlo cardinal $\alpha' < \rho$ such that for all $\beta < \alpha'$, $f(\beta) \in V_{\alpha'}$.

Let $SC = \{\mathrm{sc}_i(\kappa_n) \mid 1 \leq n < \omega, i < \omega + 3 \text{ or } n = 0, 1 \leq i < 3\}$ - the set of all relevant supercompact cardinals for the forcing and their limits. We denote $\kappa_\omega = \sup SC$.

Let us describe the forcing $\mathbb{P}$. Informally, we can think of $\mathbb{P}$ as an iteration of length κ_ω (where the support is non-standard). The iteration is designed in a way that the cardinals in the intervals $(\mathrm{sc}_i(\kappa_n), \mathrm{sc}_{i+1}(\kappa_n))$ are collapsed, while all

cardinals in SC as well as ρ^+ and the successors of the singular limits of SC are preserved. Thus, every cardinal of the form $\mathrm{sc}_i(\kappa_n)$ becomes successor of regular cardinal in the generic extension. In order for it to have the tree property, a necessary condition is to violate GCH below the predecessor of every successor of regular. So, we pick a cardinal below the predecessor of $\mathrm{sc}_i(\kappa_n)$ and blow up its continuum to be $\mathrm{sc}_i(\kappa_n)$. For double successors of regular cardinals, $\mathrm{sc}_{i+2}(\kappa_n)$, we simply pick $\mathrm{sc}_i(\kappa_n)$. For double successors of singular cardinals, $\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+1}(\kappa_n)$, we choose to blow up the continuum of κ_n. Then, we will continue to collapse cardinals in the intervals between elements of SC and below ρ^+ in order to get the right cardinals structure. Therefore, the final structure of the continuum function is going to be $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_2$, $2^{\aleph_{\omega\cdot n+4}} = \aleph_{\omega\cdot(n+1)+2}$, $2^{\aleph_{\omega\cdot n+1}} = \aleph_{\omega\cdot n+3}$, $2^{\aleph_{\omega\cdot n+2}} = \aleph_{\omega\cdot n+4}$.

In order to preserve the generic supercompactness of the involved cardinals, we force, using the Laver function, some guesses for the needed forcing notions ahead. We will have two types of such forcings. One, which depends only on the added reals, that will be used during the proof of the tree property at successors of singulars and one, which depends on the whole iteration, will be used in the proof of the tree property at double successors.

Let us turn now to a formal definition of the forcing:

We will follow the definitions and notations of [6]. For simplicity of notations, we fix the universal Laver function f, and it will be implicit in the definitions.

We introduce three sequences of cardinals $\langle \tau_i \mid i < \omega^2\rangle, \langle \zeta_i \mid i < \omega^2\rangle, \langle \mu_i \mid i < \omega^2\rangle$. We may think of τ_i as the cardinal to which we add subsets in the i-th step, ζ_i is the cardinal to which we collapse cardinals and μ_i is the length of the iteration in the i-th step.

(1) $\langle \zeta_i \mid i < \omega\cdot\omega\rangle$ is an increasing enumeration of the set $\{\rho^+\} \cup \{\mu \in SC \mid \mu \text{ is regular}\} \cup \{\mu^+ \mid \mu \in SC, \mu \text{ is singular}\}$.
(2) $\mu_i = \zeta_{i+1}$.
(3) $\tau_{i+1} = \zeta_i$ and $\tau_{\omega\cdot n} = \kappa_n$, for $n > 0$. For $n = 0$, we will use $\tau_0 = \omega$.

Let us define the forcing $\mathbb{A}$. Let $\mathbb{A}_i = \mathrm{Add}(\tau_i, \mu_i \setminus \zeta_i)$ and let:

$$\mathbb{A} = \prod_{i<\omega^2} \mathbb{A}_i = \prod_{i<\omega^2} \mathrm{Add}(\tau_i, \mu_i \setminus \zeta_i)$$

full support product.

The elements of the forcing $\mathbb{A}_i$ are partial functions from $\mu_i \setminus \zeta_i$ to 2 with domain of size $< \tau_i$. Therefore, for a condition $p \in \mathbb{A}_i$, the restriction $p \restriction \alpha$ is a condition in $\mathrm{Add}(\tau_i, \alpha \cap (\mu_i \setminus \zeta_i))$.

Following [6], we will denote by $\mathbb{A}_{[i,j)}$ the partial product $\prod_{i\le k<j} \mathbb{A}_k$. Similarly, for a given set of ordinals $I \subseteq \omega^2$, we will denote by $\mathbb{A}_I$ the product $\prod_{i\in I} \mathbb{A}_i$. We will denote by $\mathbb{A}_i \restriction \alpha$ the forcing $\{p \restriction \alpha \mid p \in \mathbb{A}_i\} = \mathrm{Add}(\tau_i, \alpha \cap (\mu_i \setminus \zeta_i))$. This forcing embeds naturally into the forcing $\mathbb{A}_i$ and we will use this embedding transparently. We will denote $\mathbb{A} \restriction \alpha = \prod_{i<\omega^2} \mathbb{A}_i \restriction \alpha$ (where for $\zeta_i \ge \alpha$ the forcing $\mathbb{A}_i \restriction \alpha$ is trivial).

Let us define the forcing $\mathbb{B} \restriction \alpha$, by induction on $\alpha \le \kappa_\omega$ and the value of $\rho = \eta_0$.

let Ind_0 be the set of all cardinals ρ which are singular limit of Mahlo cardinal, closed under f, of countable cofinality.

We will denote by $\mathbb{B}^\rho$ the forcing notion $\mathbb{B}$ as defined for $\rho = \eta_0$. We will denote by $\mathbb{A}_0^\rho$ the forcing notion $\mathbb{A}_0$ as defined when $\eta_0 = \rho$.

The elements of $\mathbb{B}^\rho \restriction \alpha$ are partial functions with domain which is subset of α. The support of any $p \in \mathbb{B}^\rho \restriction \alpha$ is Easton, namely $|\operatorname{dom} p \cap \gamma| < \gamma$ for every inaccessible $\gamma \le \alpha$. For every $\gamma \in \operatorname{dom} p$, $\mathbb{A}_0 \restriction \gamma * \mathbb{B} \restriction \gamma \Vdash p(\gamma) \in \mathbb{Q}_\gamma$, where $\mathbb{Q}_\gamma$ is the full support iteration of all forcing notions $\mathbb{D}_\gamma^\xi$ such that:

(1) $\langle \mathbb{A}_0^\xi \restriction \gamma * \mathbb{B}^\xi \restriction \gamma, \mathbb{D}^\xi\rangle \in f(\gamma)$, $\xi \le \rho$, $\xi \in Ind_0$.

(2) For every $\mathbb{R}$, if $\langle \mathbb{A}_0^\xi \restriction \gamma * \mathbb{B}^\xi \restriction \gamma, \mathbb{R}\rangle \in f(\gamma)$ then $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{D}^\xi$.
(3) $\mathbb{D}^\xi$ is forced to be canonically γ-directed closed forcing in the generic extension by

$$\mathbb{A}_0^\xi \restriction \gamma * \mathbb{B}^\xi \restriction \gamma * \mathbb{Q}_\gamma \restriction \xi.$$

$\mathbb{B} = \mathbb{B}^{\eta_0} \restriction \kappa_\omega$. Let $G_A \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ be V-generic filter for $\mathbb{A}$. In $V[G_A]$, we order $\mathbb{B}$ in the natural way: $p \leq q$ iff $\operatorname{dom} p \supseteq \operatorname{dom} q$ and for every $\alpha \in \operatorname{dom} q$, $p \restriction \alpha \Vdash \forall \xi \in \operatorname{dom} p(\alpha)$, $p(\alpha)^{G_A}(\xi) \leq_{(\mathbb{D}^\xi_\alpha)^{G_A}} q(\alpha)^{G_A}(\xi)$.

We will use the notation $\mathbb{B}_\rho$ to denote the iteration of the ρ-th component of the products and $\mathbb{B}_{<\rho}$ to denote all components below ρ. $\mathbb{B}_\rho$ is defined in $\mathbb{A}_0 * \mathbb{B}_{<\rho}$, and $\mathbb{B}_{<\rho}$ can be seen as an iteration of $\mathbb{B}_{\rho'}$ for $\rho' < \rho$.

We denote by $\hat{\mathbb{B}}$ the iterated termspace forcing for the forcing $\mathbb{B}$ over $\mathbb{A}_0$. Note that $\hat{\mathbb{B}}^\rho$ splits into a product of size ρ of the termspace forcing for the forcing notions that were picked for every $\rho' \leq \rho$.

Intuitively, we want to think about $\mathbb{B}^\rho$ as an attempt to make every supercompact cardinal, κ, indestructible under κ-directed closed forcing notions, while adding more and more Cohen reals.

Let us define the last forcing notion $\mathbb{C}$, by induction. $\mathbb{C}$ is the full support iteration over the forcing notions $\mathbb{C}_i$, $i < \omega^2$. For $\alpha < \kappa_\omega$, if i is the first ordinal for which $\alpha < \mu_i$, we denote by $\mathbb{C} \restriction \alpha$ the full support iteration over $\mathbb{C}_j$ for $j < i$, and then iterated by $\mathbb{C}_i \restriction \alpha$.

For $i < \omega \cdot \omega$, $\mathbb{C}_i \restriction \alpha$ is defined by induction on $\alpha \leq \mu_i$. For $\alpha \leq \zeta_i$, $\mathbb{C}_i \restriction \alpha$ is trivial. For $p \in \mathbb{C}_i \restriction \alpha$, p is a partial function, $\operatorname{dom} p \subseteq \alpha$ and $|\operatorname{dom} p| < \zeta_i$. For all $\gamma \in \operatorname{dom} p$, $p(\gamma) \in \mathbb{R}_\gamma$ where:

(1) $\langle \mathbb{A} \restriction \gamma * \mathbb{B} \restriction \gamma * \mathbb{C} \restriction \gamma, \mathbb{R}_\gamma\rangle \in f(\gamma)$.
(2) For every $\mathbb{R}$, if $\langle \mathbb{A} \restriction \gamma * \mathbb{B} \restriction \gamma * \mathbb{C} \restriction \gamma, \mathbb{R}\rangle \in f(\gamma)$, then $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}_\gamma$.
(3) $\mathbb{R}_\gamma$ is forces to be canonically ζ_i-directed closed forcing in the generic extension by $\mathbb{A} \restriction \gamma * \mathbb{B} \restriction \gamma * \mathbb{C} \restriction \gamma$.

$\mathbb{C}_i = \mathbb{C}_i \restriction \mu_i$. As in the case of $\mathbb{B}$, we denote by $\hat{\mathbb{C}}_i$ the termspace forcing for $\mathbb{C}_i$, and we order $\mathbb{C}$ in the natural order in the generic extension by $\mathbb{A} * \mathbb{B}$. We denote by $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ the full support product $\prod_{i<\omega^2} \hat{\mathbb{C}}_i$.

The forcing $\mathbb{P}$ is the full iteration $\mathbb{A} * \mathbb{B} * \mathbb{C} \times \operatorname{Col}(\omega, \rho)$. We will denote $\mathbb{P} \restriction \alpha = \mathbb{A} \restriction \alpha * \mathbb{B} \restriction \alpha * \mathbb{C} \restriction \alpha$. Note that $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P} \restriction \kappa_\omega \times \operatorname{Col}(\omega, \rho)$.

We will use the notations $\mathbb{B} \restriction [\alpha, \beta)$, $\hat{\mathbb{B}} \restriction [\alpha, \beta)$ and so on with the natural interpretation (the name for the iteration between steps α and β, or the termspace forcing for this iteration respectively).

We remark that the underlying sets of all forcing notions are in the ground model V. Nevertheless, the order relation of $\mathbb{B}$ depends on the generic filter $\mathbb{A}_0$ and the order relation of $\mathbb{C}$ depends on the generic filter for both $\mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{B}$.

3.2. **Basic Properties.** The following lemmas can be deduces from their corresponding lemmas in [6]:

Lemma 19. *$\hat{\mathbb{C}}_i$ is ζ_i-directed closed. $\hat{\mathbb{B}} \restriction [\alpha, \kappa_\omega)$ is α-directed closed.*

Lemma 20. *For Mahlo cardinal κ, which is closed under f, the forcing notions $\mathbb{B} \restriction \kappa, \mathbb{C} \restriction \kappa, \mathbb{A} \restriction \kappa, \hat{\mathbb{B}} \restriction \kappa$ and $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \restriction \kappa$ are κ-Knaster.*

Lemma 21. *There is a continuous projection from $\mathbb{A} \restriction \alpha \times \hat{\mathbb{B}} \restriction \alpha \times \hat{\mathbb{C}} \restriction \alpha$ to $\mathbb{P} \restriction \alpha$.*

These projections allow us to split the forcing $\mathbb{P}$ (using the termspace forcing) in various ways to a projection of a product of a closed forcing and forcing that has a good chain condition.

Lemma 22. *Let $\eta \in SC$ be a regular cardinal. Then every set of ordinals of cardinality $< \eta$ in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$ is covered by a set of cardinality $< \eta$ from V.*

Proof. Let $\eta \in SC$ be a regular cardinal. By construction, η is a closure point of f, since η is supercomapct and for every $\alpha < \eta$, $f(\alpha) \in V_\eta$. $\mathbb{A}$ splits into a product of η-closed and η-Knaster forcing (by taking $\mathbb{A} = \prod_{\tau_i \geq \eta} \mathbb{A}_i \times \prod_{\tau_i < \eta} \mathbb{A}_i$). $\hat{\mathbb{B}}$ splits into a product of η-closed forcing and η-Knaster forcing, $\hat{\mathbb{B}} = \hat{\mathbb{B}} \restriction \eta \times \hat{\mathbb{B}} \restriction [\eta, \kappa_\omega)$. The same arguments hold for $\mathbb{C}$. $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \restriction \eta$ is η-Knaster and $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \restriction [\eta, \kappa_\omega)$ is η-closed. We conclude that it is possible to find a forcing, $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$, which is a product of a η-closed and η-Knaster forcing notions and $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$ projects onto $\mathbb{P}$. Therefore, by Easton's lemma, η is preserved. Moreover, every subset of ordinals of cardinality $< \eta$ in the generic extension $\mathbb{A} \times \hat{\mathbb{B}} \times \hat{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho)$ is covered by a set of cardinality $< \eta$ in the ground model. Since this model is a generic extension of $V^{\mathbb{P}}$, we conclude that the same holds in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$. □

From the lemma above, we can conclude that the covering property holds also for cardinal τ which is successor of singular element in SC. We will show that this follows from the covering property at smaller cardinals:

Lemma 23. *Assume that $W_1 \subseteq W_2$ are models of set theory, μ is a limit singular cardinal in W_1, and there is a cofinal set of cardinals $\langle \lambda_i \mid i < \operatorname{cf} \mu \rangle$, $\sup_i \lambda_i = \mu$ such that for every $i < \operatorname{cf} \mu$ and any set of ordinals in W_2 of cardinality $< \lambda_i$ there is a set of ordinals in W_1 of cardinality $< \lambda_i$ in W_1 covering it. Then, every set of ordinals of cardinality μ in W_2 is covered by a set of ordinals in W_1 of cardinality μ in W_1.*

Proof. Assume, without loss of generality, that $\operatorname{cf} \mu < \lambda_0$.

Let $A \in W_2$, $A \subseteq \mathrm{Ord}$, $|A|^{W_2} = \mu$. Let $\lambda = \sup A$. Let us split A to $\operatorname{cf} \mu$ sets $A_i \in W_2$ such that $|A_i| < \lambda_i$. Let us pick, in W_2, for every $i < \operatorname{cf} \mu$ a set $B_i \subseteq \lambda$ such that $|B_i|^{W_1} < \lambda_i$ and $A_i \subseteq B_i$. Let $g \colon (P_\mu \lambda)^{W_1} \to \lambda_\star$ be an enumeration in W_1. The set $\{g(B_i) \mid i < \operatorname{cf} \mu\} \in W_2$ is a set of ordinals of cardinality $< \lambda_0$. Thus, it can be covered by a set of ordinals $C \subseteq \lambda_\star$ of cardinality $< \lambda_0 < \mu$. The set $B = \bigcup_{\alpha \in C} g^{-1}(\alpha)$ covers A and have cardinality $\leq \mu \cdot \mu$ in W_1, as wanted. □

The previous lemma entails the preservation of the cardinals in the set $\{\rho^+\} \cup SC \cup \{\mathrm{sc}_\omega(\kappa_n)^+ \mid 0 < n < \omega\}$.

The following lemma, due to Abraham [1], is used in order to conclude the the good Knaster properties of the forcing notions $\mathbb{A}_i$ are preserved in the generic extension and in the intermediate models.

Claim 24. *Let $V \subseteq W$ be two models of* ZFC*. Let $\kappa < \lambda < \mu$ be cardinals with κ regular and λ, μ strongly inaccessible in V. Assume that:*

1. *κ, λ are cardinals in W.*
2. *For every $x \in W$, $x \subseteq Ord$, if $W \models |x| < \kappa$ then there is $y \in V$ such that $|y| < \kappa$ and $x \subseteq y$.*

Then the forcing $\mathrm{Add}^V(\kappa, \mu)$ is λ-Knaster in W.

Combining Lemma 22 and Claim 24, we conclude that for every regular κ, $\lambda \in SC$ regular and $\mu \in SC$ regular, where $\kappa < \lambda < \mu$, the forcing notion $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \mu)$ is λ-Knaster.

Let us observe that every other cardinal between ω and κ_ω is collapsed:

Lemma 25. *$\mathbb{C}_i$ collapses all cardinals between ζ_i and μ_i.*

Proof. Since f is a Laver function. There is an elementary embedding with critical point μ_i in which $j(f)(\mu_i)$ is $\{\langle x, y \rangle\}$ where x is $\mathbb{P} \restriction \mu_i$ and y is the canonical $\mathbb{P} \restriction \mu_i$-name for $\mathrm{Col}(\zeta_i, \mu_i)$. Therefore, for unboundedly many $\alpha < \mu_i$, $f(\alpha)$ is the canonical $\mathbb{P} \restriction \alpha$ name for $\mathrm{Col}(\zeta_i, \alpha)$, and therefore α is collapsed. □

Corollary 26. *The iteration is κ_ω^{++}-c.c. It forces $\aleph_{\omega^2} = \kappa_\omega$, $\rho^+ = \aleph_1$. In the generic extension, the double successor cardinals and the limit cardinals below $\aleph_{\omega^2}$ are exactly the members of SC.*

3.3. **Tree Property for successors of regular cardinals.**

Lemma 27. *In the generic extension, every double successor cardinal $\mu < \aleph_{\omega^2}$ is generically supercompact by a forcing notion which cannot add a branch to a μ-Aronszajn tree.*

Corollary 28. *The tree property holds at every double successor cardinal below $\aleph_{\omega^2}$ in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$.*

The proofs of Lemma 27 and Corollary 28 can be found in [9].

Since our forcing notion differs slightly from the one which is used in [9], we will indicate the main points in the proof.

Proof. First, let us show that Lemma 27 implies Corollary 28. Assume that μ is a regular cardinal, and there is a forcing notion $\mathbb{R}$ that adds an elementary embedding $j\colon V^{\mathbb{P}} \to M$, with critical point μ. For every μ-tree in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$, T, $j(T)$ is a $j(\mu)$-tree and in particular, it has a member in level μ. Let t be such an element and let $b = \{s \in T \mid j(s) \leq_{j(T)} t\}$. b is a branch in T, since the levels of T below μ have size $< \mu$, and thus $j(T)_\beta = j(T)_{j(\beta)} = j\,{}^{\prime\prime}\, T_\beta$ for all $\beta < \mu$.

In particular, in $V^{\mathbb{P}*\mathbb{R}}$, T has a cofinal branch. By the assumption on $\mathbb{R}$, T is not Aronszajn in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$.

Let us sketch a proof for Lemma 27. Let $\mu \in SC$ and assume that μ is supercompact. Let $i < \omega \cdot \omega$ be the ordinal for which $\mu = \mu_i$. The forcing $\mathbb{P} \restriction \mu$ is μ-Knaster.

Let us force first with $\mathbb{A}_I = \prod_{k\in I} \mathbb{A}_k$ where I is the set of all $k < \omega^2$ such that $\tau_k \geq \mu$, and let G_{A_I} be the generic filter. By the indestructibility of μ in V, μ is still supercompact in the generic extension, $V[G_{A_I}]$. For every $k \in \omega^2 \setminus I$, $\tau_k < \mu$ and therefore (by the remarks after Claim 24), the forcing notions $\mathbb{A}_k$ for $k \notin I$ are μ-Knaster. Let $j\colon V[G_{A_I}] \to M$ be a λ-supercompact embedding, $\lambda > \kappa_\omega$, and assume that

$$j(f)(\mu) = \{\langle \mathbb{A}_0^\rho \restriction \mu * \mathbb{B}^\rho \restriction \mu, \mathbb{B}_\rho \restriction [\mu,\lambda)\rangle \mid \rho < \eta_0\} \cup \{\langle \mathbb{P} \restriction \mu, \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{C}\restriction[\mu,\lambda)}_{\mathbb{A}_{\omega^2\setminus I\setminus i}}\rangle, \lambda^+\}$$

where $\mathbb{B}_\rho \restriction [\mu,\lambda)$ is the iteration of the components of $\mathbb{B}_\rho$ between μ and λ relative to the previous phases in $\mathbb{B}$, $\mathbb{B}_{<\rho}$. Note that all the generic reals were introduced by $\mathbb{A}_0 \restriction \mu$, so we do not need to consider them.

Let $\mathbb{P}' = \mathbb{P}/\mathbb{A}_I$. Let us analyse the forcing $j(\mathbb{P}')$.

$$\begin{aligned} j(\mathbb{P}') = \quad & j(\mathbb{A}_{\omega^2\setminus I}) * \\ & \mathbb{B} \restriction \mu * \mathbb{B} \restriction [\mu,\lambda) * j(\mathbb{B}) \restriction [\mu+1, j(\lambda)) * \\ & \mathbb{C} \restriction \mu * \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{C}\restriction[\mu,\lambda)}_{\mathbb{A}_{\omega^2\setminus I\setminus i}} * j(\mathbb{C}) \restriction [\mu+1, j(\lambda)) \end{aligned}$$

Let us start with $j(\mathbb{A}_{\omega^2\setminus I})$. If $k \in \omega^2 \setminus I$ and $\mu_k < \mu_i$ then $j(\mathbb{A}_k) = \mathbb{A}_k$. If $\mu_k \geq \mu$ then since $\tau_k < \mu$, for $p \in \mathrm{Add}(\tau_k, \mu_k \setminus \zeta_k)$, $j(p) \in \mathrm{Add}(\tau_k, j(\mu_k \setminus \zeta_k))$ and moreover $j\,{}^{\prime\prime}\, p = j(p)$. Thus, j induces an isomorphism between $\mathrm{Add}(\tau_k, \mu_k)$ and $\mathrm{Add}(\tau_k, j\,{}^{\prime\prime}(\mu_k \setminus \zeta_k))$ which is a regular subforcing of $\mathrm{Add}(\tau_k, j(\mu_k \setminus \zeta_k))$.

Therefore, there is a projection from $j(\mathbb{P}')$ onto $\mathbb{P}'$ given by evaluating the terms in the coordinate μ of $\mathbb{B}$ and $\mathbb{C}$ in $j(\mathbb{P})$ using the j-preimage of the restriction of the generic filter to $j\,{}^{\prime\prime}\, \mathbb{A}_{\omega^2\setminus I}$ and $G_{A\restriction I}$ which belongs to M (by the closure of M). Using the directed closure of both $j(\mathbb{C}) \restriction [j(\mu), j(\kappa_\omega))$ and $j(\mathbb{B}) \restriction [j(\mu), j(\kappa_\omega))$ (both are at least λ^+-directed closed in the appropriate universes), there is a unique lower bound for the set of conditions $j(b)$ such that b appears in the generic filter for $\mathbb{B} \restriction [\mu, \kappa_\omega)$. This condition is constructed by induction on $\rho \leq \eta_0$. For each ρ,

we apply the directed closure of the forcing notions in the ρ-th component of the product that defines a given step of the iteration $\mathbb{B}$. Note that the forcing notion for the ρ-th component depends only on the generic filter for the previous components and thus, by induction, it can be constructed.

Similarly, there is a unique lower bound for the conditions $j(c)$ such that c appears in the generic filter for $\mathbb{C} \restriction [\mu, \lambda)$. Combining this two together, we obtain a master condition for the forcing $\mathbb{B} * \mathbb{C} \restriction [\mu, \lambda)$. Therefore, there is a generic filter H for $j(\mathbb{P})$ and a generic filter $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ such that for every $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $j(p) \in H$. Using Silver's criteria, we extend j to an elementary embedding, $\tilde{j} \colon V[G] \to M[H]$.

Let us analyse the forcing notion that adds H to $V[G]$. This forcing is:

$$j(\mathbb{P}')/\mathbb{P}' = \begin{array}{c} \Big(j(\mathbb{A}_{\omega^2 \setminus I})/j \text{ `` } \mathbb{A}_{\omega^2 \setminus I}\Big) \\ * j(\mathbb{B}) \restriction [\mu+1, j(\lambda)) \\ * \Big(\mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{C} \restriction [\mu,\lambda)}_{\mathbb{A}_{\omega^2 \setminus I \setminus i}} * j(\mathbb{C}) \restriction [\mu+1, j(\lambda))\Big)/\mathbb{C} \restriction [\mu, \lambda) \end{array}$$

notion is a projection of the product of:

(1) $\mathbb{D}_0 = \mathbb{T}^{j(\mathbb{B}) \restriction [\mu+1, j(\lambda))}_{j(\mathbb{A}_0) \restriction [\mu, \lambda)}$
(2) $\mathbb{D}_1 = j(\mathbb{A}_{\omega^2 \setminus I})/(j \text{ `` } \mathbb{A}_{\omega^2 \setminus I})$
(3) $\mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{T}^{j(\mathbb{C}) \restriction [\mu+1, j(\lambda))}_{j(\mathbb{A} * \mathbb{B}) \restriction [\mu, \lambda)}$
(4) $\mathbb{D}_3 = \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{C} \restriction [\mu, \lambda)}_{\mathbb{A}_{\omega^2 \setminus I \setminus i}}/\mathbb{C} \restriction [\mu, \lambda))$.

as computed in $V[G]$. Let us discuss those terms one by one.

The forcing $\mathbb{D}_0 = \mathbb{T}^{j(\mathbb{B}) \restriction [\mu+1, j(\lambda))}_{j(\mathbb{A}) \restriction [\mu+1, \lambda)}$ is at least λ^{++}-distributive (since the next non trivial coordinate in $j(\mathbb{B})$ must be an inaccessible cardinal α satisfying $f(\mu) \in V_\alpha$). It is also λ^{++}-distributive in the generic extension by $\mathbb{P}$ and in particular cannot add a branch to a tree T.

The forcing $\mathbb{D}_1 = j(\mathbb{A}_{\omega^2 \setminus I})/(j \text{ `` } \mathbb{A}_{\omega^2 \setminus I})$ is equivalent to the product of two or three forcing notions of the form $\mathrm{Add}(\tau_k, j(\mu_k) \setminus j \text{ `` } \mu_k \setminus j(\zeta_k))$ (depends on the nature of i for which $\mu = \mu_i$). One of those elements is $\mathrm{Add}(\zeta_i, j(\mu_{i+1}) \setminus j \text{ `` } \mu_{i+1} \setminus j(\zeta_{i+1}))$ and the others are $\zeta_i$-c.c. The forcing $\mathrm{Add}(\zeta_i, j(\mu_{i+1}) \setminus j \text{ `` } \mu_{i+1} \setminus j(\zeta_{i+1}))$ is ζ_i-distributive and μ-Knaster (and this remains true also after forcing $\mathbb{D}_0$), and therefore it cannot add a branch to an Aronszajn tree in the generic extension. The product of the other components (or component) is ζ_i-c.c. also in the generic extension by $\mathbb{D}_0 \times \mathrm{Add}(\zeta_i, j(\mu_{i+1}) \setminus j \text{ `` } \mu_{i+1} \setminus j(\zeta_{i+1}))$ (by the distributivity of this product). Therefore, it cannot add a branch to a μ-Aronszajn tree.

The forcing $\mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{T}^{j(\mathbb{C}) \restriction [\mu+1, j(\lambda))}_{j(\mathbb{A} * \mathbb{B}) \restriction [\mu+1, \lambda)}$ is ζ_i-closed in the generic extension by $\mathbb{P} \restriction \mu$. In this model $2^{\tau_i} = \mu_i$ and $\tau_i < \zeta_i$, and therefore it cannot add a branch in this model. This remains true after forcing with $\mathbb{D}_0 \times \mathbb{D}_1$ using Lemma 12.

Lastly, let us deal with the forcing $\mathbb{D}_3 = \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{C} \restriction [\mu, \lambda)}_{\mathbb{A}_{\omega^2 \setminus I \setminus i}}/\mathbb{C} \restriction [\mu, \lambda)$, as defined in the generic extension by $\mathbb{A}_{\omega^2 \setminus I} * \mathbb{B} \restriction [\mu, \lambda)$. This forcing is ζ_i-closed (as a continuous quotient of a ζ_i-closed forcing notions). It remains ζ_i-closed in the generic extension by $\mathbb{D}_0 \times \mathbb{D}_1 \times \mathrm{Add}(\zeta_i, j(\mu_{i+1}) \setminus j \text{ `` } \mu_{i+1} \setminus j(\zeta_{i+1}))$. Therefore, in the generic extension by $\mathbb{D}_0 \times \mathbb{D}_1 \times \mathbb{D}_2$, $\mathbb{D}_3$ cannot add a branch by Lemma 12. □

3.4. **Tree Property for successors of singular cardinals.** Let us discuss now the tree property at successors of singular cardinals below $\aleph_{\omega^2}$.

Let κ be a supercompact cardinal. We define a forcing notion which, on one hand, forces the tree property at $\mathrm{sc}_\omega(\kappa)^+$ and on the other hand can be projected onto the segment $\mathbb{P} \restriction \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)$ assuming that we pick $\kappa_n = \kappa$ $(n > 0)$.

For a given finite sequence of cardinals, let $\mathbb{P}^\eta$ be the initial segment of the forcing $\mathbb{P}$ which is defined assuming that $\kappa_0 = \eta_0, \ldots, \kappa_{n-1} = \eta_{n-1}, \kappa_n = \kappa$. $\mathbb{P}^\eta$ does not

include the final collapse $\mathrm{Col}(\omega,\rho)$. We will define $\mathbb{A}^\eta$, $\mathbb{B}^\eta$, $\mathbb{C}^\eta$ similarly. Note that $\mathbb{B}^\eta$ depends only on η_0, so we will use freely the notation $\mathbb{B}^{\eta_0}$.

Let us define the forcing $\mathbb{R}$. Intuitively, $\mathbb{R}$ is the full support product of all possible values for the κ-closed parts of the forcing $\mathbb{P}^\eta$, where η is a finite increasing sequence of cardinals below κ.

Let us turn now to a formal definition of $\mathbb{R}$. Let us look at the following posets:

(1) $\mathbb{A}_0 = \mathrm{Add}(\omega,\kappa)$.
(2) $\mathbb{B}^\kappa$.
(3) Let Ind_1 be the set of all finite sequences $\eta \in \kappa^{<\omega}$ such that $\eta_0 \in Ind_0$ and for every $i>0$, η_i is a supercomapct limit of supercompacts. Let $\mathbb{R}^\eta$ be the termspace forcing $\mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{C}^\eta\restriction[\kappa,\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))}_{\mathbb{A}^\eta_{[1,\omega\cdot\mathrm{len}(\eta)+2}*\mathbb{C}^\eta\restriction\kappa}$, as computed in the generic extension by $\mathbb{A}_0^{\eta_0}*\mathbb{B}^{\eta_0}$.

Let:

$$\mathbb{R} = \left(\mathbb{A}_0 * \mathbb{B}^\kappa * \prod_{\eta\in Ind_1}\mathbb{R}^\eta\right)\times\mathbb{E}$$

where

$$\mathbb{E} = \mathrm{Add}(\kappa,\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)\setminus\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+1}(\kappa))\times\prod\mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa),\mathrm{sc}_{n+2}(\kappa)\setminus\mathrm{sc}_{n+1}(\kappa))$$

The product is full and taken in the generic extension by $\mathbb{B}_\kappa$ in the following sense: an element in $r\in\prod_{\eta\in\kappa^{<\omega}}\mathbb{R}$ is a function, $r\in V$, $\mathrm{dom}\, r=\kappa^{<\omega}$ and $r(\eta)$ is a $\mathbb{B}^{\eta_0}$-name for an element in $\mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{C}^\eta\restriction[\kappa,\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))}_{\mathbb{A}^\eta_{[1,\omega\cdot\mathrm{len}(\eta)+2}*\mathbb{C}^\eta\restriction\kappa}$. We order the product naturally: $r\leq r'$ iff for every $\eta\in\kappa^{<\omega}$, the generic filter for $\mathbb{B}^{\eta_0}$ forces $r(\eta)\leq r(\eta')$ in the order of the termspace forcing.

Note that since $\mathbb{B}^\kappa$ projects onto $\mathbb{B}^{\eta_0}$ for every $\eta_0\in Ind_0$, $\mathbb{R}^\eta$ is well defined for every $\eta\in Ind_1$. In the rest of the proof we will always assume that $\eta_0\in Ind_0$ and $\eta\in Ind_1$. For simplicity of notations, in the definition of $\mathbb{B}^\kappa$ and $\mathbb{R}^\eta$ we will allow η_0 to be not from Ind_0 and η to be not from Ind_1 and in those case the corresponding forcing notions are defined to be trivial.

Let $\mathbb{L}_\rho$ be:

$$\mathrm{Col}(\omega,\rho)\times\mathrm{Col}(\rho^+,\mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa))$$

Let $\nu=\mathrm{sc}_\omega(\kappa)$.

Lemma 29. *For every choice of $\eta=\eta_0^\frown\langle\kappa\rangle$, $\eta_0\in Ind_1$, there is a continuous projection from $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{L}_{\eta_0}$ onto $\mathbb{P}^\eta\times\mathrm{Col}(\omega,\rho)$.*

Proof. Let $\rho=\eta_0$. Let us look at the termspace forcing for $\mathbb{A}_{[1,\omega\cdot(\mathrm{len}(\eta)-1)+3)}*\mathbb{C}\restriction\kappa$. This forcing is ρ^+-closed and of cardinality $\mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa)$. Therefore, there is a continuous projection from $\mathrm{Col}(\rho^+,\mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa))$ onto it. □

We will show that there is a choice of ρ for which $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{L}_\rho$ forces the tree property at $\mathrm{sc}_\omega(\kappa)^+$ and that, moreover, for this choice of ρ, for every η such that $\rho=\eta_0$, and $\kappa=\eta_n$, $\mathbb{P}^\eta$ forces the tree property at $\mathrm{sc}_\omega(\kappa)^+$. This is sufficient for our goals, since for every ω-sequence $\tilde\eta$ that end-extends η, the iteration $\mathbb{P}^{\tilde\eta}\restriction[\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2},\sup_{n<\omega}\eta_n)$ is ν^{++}-distributive.

Claim 30. *There is ρ such that $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{L}_\rho$ forces the tree property at $\mathrm{sc}_\omega(\kappa)^+$.*

Proof. We split the proof of this claim to a sequence of lemmas:

Lemma 31. *For every $\zeta>\kappa$ such that $2^\zeta=\zeta^+$, there is ζ' such that in the generic extension by $\mathbb{R}$, κ is generically ζ-supercompact by the forcing $\mathrm{Add}(\omega,\zeta')$.*

Proof. Let us force with

$$\mathbb{E} = \mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa) \setminus \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+1}(\kappa)) \times \prod \mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa), \mathrm{sc}_{n+2}(\kappa) \setminus \mathrm{sc}_{n+1}(\kappa)).$$

Let G_A be a generic filter. By the indestructibility of κ, κ is supercompact in $V[G_A]$. Let $\mathbb{R}'$ be the quotient forcing $\mathbb{R}/G_A = \mathbb{A}_0 * \mathbb{B}^\kappa * \prod \mathbb{R}^\eta$. In the generic extension κ is still supercompact. Let $j\colon V[G_A] \to M$ be a ζ-supercompact embedding and assume that $j(f)(\kappa)$ is the set:

$$\{\zeta\} \cup \{\langle \mathrm{Add}(\omega, \mathrm{sc}_2(\rho)) * \mathbb{B}^\rho \restriction \kappa, \mathbb{B}^\rho \restriction [\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)) * \prod_{\eta \in \kappa^{<\omega}, \eta_0 = \rho} \mathbb{R}^\eta \rangle \mid \rho < \kappa\}$$

$$j(\mathbb{R}') = j(\mathbb{A}_0) * j(\mathbb{B}^\kappa) * \prod_{\eta \in j(\kappa)^{<\omega}} j(\mathbb{R})^\eta.$$

Let us analyse those components:

$$j(\mathbb{A}_0) = j(\mathrm{Add}(\omega, \kappa)) = \mathrm{Add}(\omega, j(\kappa)) = \mathbb{A}_0 \times \mathrm{Add}(\omega, j(\kappa) \setminus \kappa)$$

$$j(\mathbb{B}^\kappa) = \mathbb{B}^\kappa * \prod_{\rho < \kappa} \left(\mathbb{B}^\rho \restriction [\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)) * \prod_{\eta \in \kappa^{<\omega}, \eta_0 = \rho} \mathbb{R}^\eta \right) * \mathbb{Q}_0$$

where $\mathbb{Q}_0$ is the iteration of $j(\mathbb{B}^\kappa)$ above $\kappa + 1$. Note that it is trivial below ζ^+, by our choice for $j(f)(\kappa)$.

Let us denote by $\mathbb{Q}_1 = \prod_{\eta \in j(\kappa)^{<\omega}} j(\mathbb{R})^\eta$.

We can represent $j(\mathbb{R}')$ as:

$$j(\mathbb{R}') = \mathbb{R}' * \mathrm{Add}(\omega, j(\kappa) \setminus \kappa) * \mathbb{Q}_0 * \mathbb{Q}_1$$

where $\mathbb{Q}_0$ is subsumed by a ζ^+-closed in M. $\mathbb{Q}_1$ is subsumed by a $j(\kappa)$-closed forcing in M. Those forcing notions are relatively small (they are the termspace forcings for $\mathbb{Q}_0$ and $\mathbb{Q}_1$).

Claim 32. *There is a master condition for $j(\mathbb{R}')$. Namely, that if $G \subseteq \mathbb{R}'$ is a $V[G_A]$-generic filter then in $M[G_A][G]$ there is a condition m that forces that $j(p)$ is in the generic filter for every $p \in G$.*

Proof. Let $p \in \mathbb{R}'$ and let us analyse $j(p)$. Since the $\mathrm{Add}(\omega, \kappa)$-coordinate of p is bounded below κ, it does not move. The same argument works for the parts in $\mathbb{B}^\kappa$ below κ (using the fact that the iteration is with Easton support).

Let us consider the parts of $\mathbb{B}^\kappa$ above κ. In the condition $j(p)$ all coordinates between κ and $j(\kappa)$ are trivial. The forcing notions which are used in the steps starting from $j(\kappa)$ are at least $j(\kappa)$-closed in the appropriate generic extension. We will temporarily return to the notation $\mathbb{Q}_\rho$ for the ρ-th step in the iteration of $\mathbb{B}^\kappa$ and denote by $\mathbb{Q}_\rho(\theta)$ the θ-th coordinate in the iteration $\mathbb{Q}_\rho$.

Namely, for every $\xi \geq j(\kappa)$ and every $\alpha < \kappa$, the coordinate in $j(\mathbb{Q})_\xi$ corresponding to $\mathbb{B}^\alpha$ is at least $j(\kappa)$-closed in the generic extension by the generic filter of $\mathbb{B}^\alpha$. Note that in $j(p)$ there might be "ghost" coordinates, namely coordinates that are not $j(\xi)$ for some ordinal ξ.

Let us look at the collection $\{j(p)_\zeta(\xi) \mid p \in G\}$. We want to show that it has a lower bound in $j(\mathbb{Q})_\zeta(\xi)$.

We separate the discussion into two possibilities. If $\xi < \kappa$, then this collection is $\{j(p)_\zeta(\xi) \mid p \in G\}$ which is definable from the set $\{p_\alpha(\xi) \mid \alpha \leq \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)\}$ - the generic filter for $\mathbb{B}^\xi$. The forcing notion $j(\mathbb{K})_\zeta(\xi)$ is $j(\kappa)$ canonically directed closed in the generic extension by $\mathbb{B}^\xi$ and therefore, this collection has a lower bound.

Let us look now on $\xi \geq \kappa$. The value of $j(p)_\zeta(\xi)$ depends only on the value of $p \restriction [\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))$. Now, in the forcing $j(\mathbb{R}')$, at level κ we have added for every $\rho < \kappa$ a generic filter for the tail $\mathbb{B}^\rho \restriction [\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))$. Since the forcing notion $j(\mathbb{K})_\zeta(\xi)$ is required to be ζ-directed closed with respect to the generic extension by all previous

$\mathbb{B}^\rho$ and in particular with respect to the forcing with $\mathbb{B}^\kappa$, and this set is directed, it has a lower bound.

The coordinates of $\mathbb{R}$ are all sufficiently closed with respect to the generic filter of $\mathbb{B}^\kappa \restriction \kappa+2$, and therefore we can construct a condition stronger than all $j(c)$, for c in the $\mathbb{R}$-part of the generic filter G, by the same arguments. □

Under the assumption that the embedding j is derived from a measure on $P_\kappa\zeta$ we can extend it to a generic filter: let us consider the termspace forcing for $\mathbb{Q}_0$ and $\mathbb{Q}_1$. It is ζ^+-closed in $V[G_A]$. By standard arguments, there are only $2^\zeta = \zeta^+$ many dense open sets in M for the termspace forcing for $\mathbb{Q}$ and thus we may construct an M-generic filter for this forcing. Given a generic filter for $\mathbb{R}'$, we can project the generic filter for the termspace to a generic filter of $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{Q}'$.

We conclude that in order to extend j, we only need to force with $\mathrm{Add}(\omega, j(\kappa)\setminus\kappa)$, so we may take $\zeta' = j(\kappa)$. □

The next ingredient that we need is the Narrow System Property, in the generic extension by $\mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 33. *Let $\nu = \mathrm{sc}_\omega(\kappa)$. For every $\zeta, \zeta' > \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)$, ν^+ has the Narrow System Property in the generic extension by $\mathbb{R} \times \mathrm{Add}(\omega, \zeta') \times \mathrm{Col}(\nu^+, \zeta)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a narrow system of height ν^+ and width $< \mathrm{sc}_{n-2}(\kappa)$ in the model $\mathbb{R} \times \mathrm{Add}(\omega, \zeta') \times \mathrm{Col}(\nu^+, \zeta)$. We want to show that it has a cofinal branch.

Assume, without loss of generality, that $n > 2$. Let us force with $\mathrm{Col}(\nu^+, \zeta) \times \prod_{m\geq n} \mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_m(\kappa), \mathrm{sc}_{m+2}(\kappa))$. In the generic extension $\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa)$ is supercompact (by the indestructibility). Let j be a ζ^+-supercompact embedding with critical point $\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa)$. Assume that $j(f)(\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa))$ is the set:

$$\{\zeta\}\cup$$
$$\{\langle \mathrm{Add}(\omega, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\eta_0)) * \mathbb{B}^\eta \restriction \mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa), \mathbb{B}^\eta \restriction [\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa), \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))\rangle \mid \eta < \kappa\}\cup$$
$$\{\langle \mathbb{P}^\eta \restriction \mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa), \mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{C}^\eta \restriction [\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa), \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))}_{\mathbb{A}^\eta \restriction [\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa), \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))}\rangle \mid \eta \in \kappa^{<\omega}\}$$

The forcing $j(\mathbb{R})$ adds a generic filter for $\mathbb{R}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
j(\mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_{n-2}(\kappa), \mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa))) &= \mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_{n-2}(\kappa), j(\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa))) \\
&= \mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_{n-2}(\kappa), \mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa)) \\
&\quad \times \mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_{n-2}(\kappa), j(\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa)) \setminus \mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa)) \\
j(\mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_{n-1}(\kappa), \mathrm{sc}_{n+1}(\kappa))) &= \mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_{n-1}(\kappa), j(\mathrm{sc}_{n+1}(\kappa))) \\
&= \mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_{n-1}(\kappa), j\,{}^{\prime\prime}\,\mathrm{sc}_{n+1}(\kappa)) \\
&\quad \times \mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_{n-1}(\kappa), j(\mathrm{sc}_{n+1}(\kappa)) \setminus j\,{}^{\prime\prime}\,\mathrm{sc}_{n+1}(\kappa))
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
j(\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))) &= \mathrm{Add}(\kappa, j(\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))) \\
&= \mathrm{Add}(\kappa, j\,{}^{\prime\prime}\,\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)) \\
&\quad \times \mathrm{Add}(\kappa, j(\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)) \setminus j\,{}^{\prime\prime}\,\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))
\end{aligned}$$

Using the same arguments as in the proof of the generic supercompactness of κ we conclude that j can be extended to an elementary embedding $\tilde{j}\colon V[G] \to M[G][H]$, where G is a generic filter for $\mathbb{R}$ and H is a generic filter for the quotient forcing and adding the missing small subsets.

Note that in the generic extension $V[G][H]$, $\mathcal{S}$ has a narrow system of branches. Let $\delta = \sup j\,{}^{\prime\prime}\,\nu^+$. Let $b_{R,\zeta} = \{t \in \mathcal{S} \mid j(t) \leq j(R)\langle\delta, \zeta\rangle\}$. Then as the width of the system is below the critical point of j, it is clear that

$$\mathcal{B} = \{b_{R,\zeta} \mid R \text{ is a relation in } \mathcal{S},\ \zeta < \mathrm{sc}_{n-2}(\kappa)\}$$

is a system of branches.

Let us analyse the quotient forcing. The quotient forcing consists of product of three forcing notions $\mathbb{D}_0 \times \mathbb{D}_1 \times \mathbb{D}_2$, where $\mathbb{D}_0$ is the forcing $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, j(\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)) \setminus j\,{}^{\prime\prime}\,\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))$, $\mathbb{D}_1$ is the forcing notion

$$j(\mathbb{B}^\kappa) \restriction [\zeta^+, j(\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))) * \prod_{\eta \in j(\kappa^{<\omega})} j(\mathbb{R}^\eta) \restriction [\zeta^+, j(\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))),$$

and $\mathbb{D}_2$ is:

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_{n-1}(\kappa), j(\mathrm{sc}_{n+1}(\kappa)) \setminus j\,{}^{\prime\prime}\,\mathrm{sc}_{n+1}(\kappa)) \quad \times \\ \mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_{n-2}(\kappa), j(\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa)) \setminus \mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa)) \end{array}$$

Let us show that the forcing $\mathbb{D}_0$ cannot add a cofinal branch or system of branches to $\mathcal{S}$. For simplicity, we will discuss the single branch case, but the general case is equivalent. $\mathbb{D}_0 = \mathrm{Add}(\kappa, j(\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)) \setminus j\,{}^{\prime\prime}\,\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)) \cong \mathrm{Add}(\kappa, j(\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)))$. Let us split the forcing notion $\mathbb{R}$ into two parts, $\left(\mathbb{R}/\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))\right) \times \mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))$. The second part is κ^+-c.c. (even in the extension by the first part). Therefore, there is an $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))$-name for $\mathcal{S}$ of cardinality ν^+. But if $\dot{\mathcal{B}}$ is a name for a narrow system of branches added by $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, j(\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)))$, by the same reasons, it has a name of cardinality ν^+. Using the homogeneity of $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, j(\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)))$, we may assume that $\dot{\mathcal{B}}$ is a name in the forcing $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \nu^+)$. Using the homogeneity of this forcing again, we may assume that it is an $\mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))$-name (as we can find an automorphism of the forcing notion that does not move the name for $\mathcal{S}$ and translates the name $\dot{\mathcal{B}}$ to untouched coordinates below $\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)$).

$\mathbb{D}_1$ is $\mathrm{sc}_{n-1}(\kappa)$-closed in the generic extension by $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{A}_0 * \prod \mathbb{B}^\eta * \mathbb{R}^\eta$. Since $\mathbb{D}_0$ is κ^+-c.c., by Lemma 11, $\mathbb{D}_1$ cannot add a branch to a $\mathcal{S}$. Moreover, it is still $\mathrm{sc}_{n-1}(\kappa)$-distributive in the generic extension.

Let us deal now with the forcing notion

$$\mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_{n-1}(\kappa), j(\mathrm{sc}_{n+1}(\kappa)) \setminus j\,{}^{\prime\prime}\,\mathrm{sc}_{n+1}(\kappa)) \times \mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_{n-2}(\kappa), j(\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa)) \setminus \mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa)).$$

The generic extension by $\mathbb{R} \times \mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)) * \mathbb{D}_1$ is subsumed by a forcing which is a product of two components - $\mathrm{sc}_{n-2}(\kappa)$-c.c. and $\mathrm{sc}_{n-2}(\kappa)$-closed. $\mathbb{D}_2$ is a κ_{n-2}-closed forcing notion in the generic extension by the $\mathrm{sc}_{n-2}(\kappa)$-closed part. Using Lemma 11, we conclude that $\mathbb{D}_2$ cannot add a system of branches to the branchless system $\mathcal{S}$, even after forcing with $\mathbb{D}_0$. □

Let us assume, towards a contradiction, that for every $\rho < \kappa$ there is a name $\dot{T}_\rho$ for a ν^+-Aronszajn tree in the generic extension by $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{L}_\rho$. By Lemma 31, in the generic extension by $\mathbb{R}$, κ is generically supercompact and the elementary embedding is added by the forcing $\mathrm{Add}(\omega, \zeta')$ for some $\zeta' \geq \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)$. Let us work for a moment in the generic extension by $\mathbb{R} \times \mathrm{Add}(\omega, \zeta')$. In this model, there is an elementary embedding $j \colon V^{\mathbb{R}} \to M$, with $j\,{}^{\prime\prime}\,\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa) \in M$. Applying j on the sequence of names $\dot{T}_\rho$, we conclude that in M, $j(T)_\kappa$ is a $j(\mathbb{L})_\nu$-name for a $j(\nu^+)$-Aronszajn tree. Let $\delta = \sup j\,{}^{\prime\prime}\,\nu^+ < j(\nu^+)$, and let us look at arbitrary element t in the level δ. t defines a $j(\mathbb{L})_\nu$-name for a bounded branch in the tree. Note that if we force with $\mathrm{Col}^V(\nu^+, j(\mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa)))$, then this name becomes a $\mathrm{Col}(\omega, \nu)$-name: This is true since M thinks that it is a generic extension of some model M' using $j(\mathbb{R})$, where $j \restriction V \colon V \to M'$ is supercompact embedding from V. Therefore when M computes the forcing notion $\mathrm{Col}(\nu^+, j(\mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa)))$ this is a member of M' and in particular from V. Using the closure of M' relative to V, this is the same forcing notion as in V.

Since ν^+ is still regular in this generic extension and it is the cofinality of δ, and since the forcing $\mathrm{Col}(\omega, \nu)$ has small cardinality, a cofinal part of the branch appears already in the generic extension by the collapse $\mathrm{Col}^V(\nu^+, j(\mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa)))$. Moreover, in this model we may find an unbounded subset of ν^+, I, such that for every $\alpha < \beta$ in I, it is forced by some condition that $\langle j(\alpha), \zeta\rangle \leq_{\dot{T}} \langle j(\beta), \zeta'\rangle$ for $\zeta, \zeta' <$

$j(\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa))$. This holds in M, and therefore we can reflect it, one pair of ordinals at a time, back to $V^{\mathbb{R}}$. We conclude that in the generic extension of V using $\mathbb{R}\times\mathrm{Add}(\omega,\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))\times\mathrm{Col}(\nu^+,j(\mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa)))$ there is a narrow system on ν^+: $\mathcal{S}=\langle I,\mathcal{R},\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa)\rangle$ where $\mathcal{R}=\bigcup_{\rho<\kappa}\{\rho\}\times\mathbb{L}_\rho$ and for $\alpha,\beta\in I$, $\zeta,\zeta'<\kappa_n$, $\langle\alpha,\zeta\rangle\leq_{(\rho,p)}\langle\beta,\zeta'\rangle$ if $p\Vdash_{\mathbb{L}_\rho}\langle\alpha,\zeta\rangle\leq_{\dot{T}_\rho}\langle\beta,\zeta'\rangle$. By the arguments above for every $\alpha<\beta$ in I, there is $r\in\mathcal{R}$ and $\zeta,\zeta'<\kappa_n$ such that $\langle\alpha,\zeta\rangle\leq_r\langle\beta,\zeta'\rangle$, so this is a narrow system.

By the narrow system property - there is a branch in this system, say through (ρ,p). This branch defines a branch in $\dot{T}_\rho$ in the generic extension by $\mathbb{L}_\rho$ with generic filter that contains p. We conclude that there is $\rho<\kappa$ such that the forcing $\mathrm{Add}(\omega,\zeta')\times\mathrm{Col}(\nu^+,j(\mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa)))$ adds a branch to a ν^+-Aronszajn tree, $\dot{T}_\rho$, in the generic extension by $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{L}_\rho$. Let us show that this is impossible:

First, working in the generic extension by $\mathbb{R}\times\mathrm{Col}(\rho^+,\mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa))\times\mathrm{Col}(\nu^+,j(\mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa)))$, T is still a ν^+-tree and $\mathrm{cf}\,\nu^+>\omega$ (since $\mathrm{Col}(\nu^+,j(\mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa)))$ is ν^+-distributive). Therefore the forcing notion $\mathrm{Add}(\omega,\zeta')$ cannot add a new branch to this tree.

Let us show that $\mathrm{Col}(\nu^+,j(\mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa)))$ cannot add a branch to ν^+-Aronszajn tree T from $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{L}_\rho$. We will show that this is the case even in a larger generic extension, obtained by:

$$\mathbb{L}_\rho\times\mathrm{Add}(\omega,\kappa)\times\hat{\mathbb{B}}^\kappa\times\prod_{\eta\in\kappa^{<\omega}}\hat{\mathbb{C}}^\eta\restriction\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)\times\mathbb{E}$$

Let us work in the generic extension by

$$\mathbb{E}\times\hat{\mathbb{B}}^\kappa\restriction[\rho^+,\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))\times\prod_{\eta\in\kappa^{<\omega}}\hat{\mathbb{C}}^\eta\restriction\mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa).$$

In this generic extension, T is an $\mathrm{Add}(\omega,\kappa)\times\mathbb{B}^\kappa\restriction\rho^+\times\mathrm{Col}(\omega,\rho)$-name and $\mathrm{Col}^V(\nu^+,j(\mathrm{sc}_2(\rho)))$ is ρ^+-closed.

Let us observe that this product satisfies the conditions of Lemma 8. Let μ_n be a sequence of Mahlo cardinals, closed under f, cofinal at ρ. By the construction of $\mathbb{B}^\kappa$, the conditions of the lemma are filled, as we can decompose $\hat{\mathbb{B}}^\kappa\restriction\rho^+$ as $\hat{\mathbb{B}}^\kappa\restriction\mu_n\times\hat{\mathbb{B}}^\kappa\restriction[\mu_n,\rho^+)$. □

We are now ready to conclude that if ρ is a good choice for $\mathbb{R}$ then it is a good choice for $\mathbb{P}^\eta$, for every η in which $\rho=\eta_0$.

Lemma 34. *Let ρ be a cardinal for which $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{L}_\rho$ forces the tree property at ν^+. Assume that $\rho=\eta_0$, $\mathrm{len}\,\eta=n\geq 2$ and $\eta_{n-1}=\kappa$. Then $\mathbb{P}^\eta$ forces the tree property at ν^+.*

Proof. We may assume, without loss of generality, that ρ is the limit of Mahlo cardinals which are closed under f.

There is a projection from $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{L}_\rho$ onto $\mathbb{P}^\eta\times\mathrm{Col}(\omega,\rho)$. Let us analyse the quotient forcing. We may think on the quotient as taken in two steps: First we take the quotient between $\mathbb{R}$ and the corresponding termspace forcing $\mathbb{D}^\eta=\mathbb{A}_0\restriction\mathrm{sc}_1(\eta_0)*\mathbb{B}^\rho*\mathbb{R}^\eta\times\mathbb{E}$, and analyse it in the generic extension by $\mathbb{D}^\eta\times\mathbb{L}_\rho$. Then, we continue and take the quotient between $\mathbb{D}^\eta\times\mathbb{L}_\rho$ and $\mathbb{P}^\eta$.

We will show that both parts cannot add a branch to a ν^+-Aronszajn tree.

Let $\mathbb{Q}_0$ be the first quotient, $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{D}^\eta$ as computed in the generic extension $\mathbb{L}_\rho$. By the product structure of $\mathbb{R}$:

$$\mathbb{Q}_0\cong\mathrm{Add}(\omega,\kappa\setminus\mathrm{sc}_1(\rho))*\mathbb{F}^\rho*\prod_{\theta\neq\eta}\mathbb{R}^\theta.$$

where $\mathbb{F}^\rho$ is the quotient forcing $\mathbb{B}^\kappa/\mathbb{B}^\rho$. Namely, if we let H be the generic filter for $\mathbb{B}^\rho$ and let ι_ρ be the natural projection from $\mathbb{B}^\kappa$ to $\mathbb{B}^\rho$, then $\mathbb{B}^\rho$ is the quotient forcing $\{p\in\mathbb{B}^\kappa\mid\iota_\rho(p)\in H\}$.

Claim 35. *$\mathbb{Q}_0$ does not add a branch to any ν^+-Aronszajn tree in the generic extension by $\mathbb{D}^\eta \times \mathbb{L}_\rho$.*

Proof. Let us claim that there are forcing notions, $\hat{\mathbb{D}}^\eta, \hat{\mathbb{Q}}_0$, such that there is a projection from $\hat{\mathbb{D}}^\eta$ to $\mathbb{D}^\eta$, and in the generic extension by $\mathbb{D}^\eta$, there is a projection from $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_0$ to $\mathbb{Q}_0$.

Let $\hat{\mathbb{D}}^\eta$ be the iterated termspace forcing for $\mathbb{D}^\eta$, namely:

$$\hat{\mathbb{D}}^\eta = \mathrm{Add}(\omega, \mathrm{sc}_1(\rho)) \times \hat{\mathbb{B}}^\rho \times \hat{\mathbb{R}}^\eta.$$

Let $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_0$ be the iterated termspace forcing for $\mathbb{Q}_0$, namely:

$$\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_0 = \mathrm{Add}(\omega, \kappa \setminus \mathrm{sc}_1(\rho)) \times \hat{\mathbb{F}}^\rho \times \prod_{\theta \neq \eta} \hat{\mathbb{R}}^\theta.$$

Let T be a ν^+-tree in the generic extension by $\mathbb{L}_\rho \times \mathbb{D}^\eta$. Since $\hat{\mathbb{D}}^\eta$ does not collapse the cardinals $\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa)$, and ν^+, T exists in the generic extension by $\hat{\mathbb{D}}^\eta$ and it is a ν^+-tree there.

Let $\langle \mu_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ of Mahlo cardinals, closed under f with $\sup \mu_n = \rho$.

Let us represent $\hat{\mathbb{D}}^\eta \times \mathbb{L}_\rho$ as a product:

$$\mathrm{Add}(\omega, \mathrm{sc}_1(\rho)) \times \prod_n \mathbb{T}_n \times \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho) \times \mathbb{Z}$$

Where $\mathbb{Z}$ is ρ^+-closed forcing, for each $n > 0$, $\mathbb{T}_n$ is μ_{n-1}-closed and μ_n-c.c. forcing notion, and $\mathbb{T}_0$ is μ_0-c.c.

We represent $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_0$ as a product of two components $\mathrm{Add}(\omega, \kappa \setminus \mathrm{sc}_1(\rho)) \times \mathbb{Z}'$, where $\mathbb{Z}'$ is ρ^+-closed. $\mathbb{Z}'$ consists of of $\hat{\mathbb{F}}^\rho \times \prod_{\theta \neq \eta} \hat{\mathbb{R}}^\theta$.

It is enough to show that in the generic extension by $\hat{\mathbb{D}}^\eta \times \mathbb{L}_\rho$, $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_0$ does not add any branch to T. Let us show first that $\mathbb{Z}'$ cannot add a branch to T.

Indeed, in the generic extension by $\mathbb{Z}$, T is added by a forcing notion that satisfies the conditions of Lemma 8, and $\mathbb{Z}'$ is still ρ^+-closed in this model. Let us work in the generic extension by $\mathbb{Z}$ as well. Since $\mathrm{Add}(\omega, \kappa \setminus \mathrm{sc}_1(\rho))$ is a small forcing notion, it cannot add a new branch to any ν^+-tree. □

Let us analyse the second quotient forcing. Let $\mathbb{Q}_1$ be the quotient between $\mathbb{D}^\eta \times \mathbb{L}_\rho$ and $\mathbb{P}^\eta \times \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho)$.

Since we do not need to change η until the end of the proof of this lemma, we will suppress it in the notations ahead.

Lemma 36. *$\mathbb{Q}_1$ cannot add a branch to ν^+-Aronszajn tree.*

Proof. Let us analyse the quotient of $\mathbb{L}_\rho \times \mathbb{D}^\eta$ relative to the generic filter for $\mathbb{P}^\eta \times \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{L}_\rho \times \mathbb{D}^\eta \quad = \quad & \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho) \times \\
& \mathrm{Col}(\rho^+, \mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa)) \times \\
& (\mathrm{Add}(\omega, \mathrm{sc}_1(\rho)) * \mathbb{B}^\rho * \mathbb{R}^\eta) \times \\
& \mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)) \times \prod \mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa), \mathrm{sc}_{n+2}(\kappa)) \\
\mathbb{P}^\eta \times \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho) \quad = \quad & \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho) \times \\
& (\mathrm{Add}(\omega, \mathrm{sc}_1(\rho)) * \mathbb{B}^\rho * \mathbb{C}^\eta) \\
& \times \mathbb{A}^\eta_{[1, \omega \cdot n]} \times \mathrm{Add}(\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)) \times \prod \mathrm{Add}(\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa), \mathrm{sc}_{n+2}(\kappa))
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms, we can evaluate this forcing notion in the generic extension by $\mathbb{E} \times \mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho) \times (\mathrm{Add}(\omega, \mathrm{sc}_1(\rho)) * \mathbb{B}^\rho)$ as the quotient:

$$\frac{\mathrm{Col}(\rho^+, \mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa)) \times \mathbb{R}^\eta}{\mathbb{A}^\eta_{[1, \omega \cdot n]} * \mathbb{C}^\eta}$$

The projection is defined as followed: $\mathrm{Col}(\rho^+, \mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa))$ is projected continuously onto $\mathbb{A}^\eta_{[1,\omega\cdot n]} * \mathbb{C} \restriction \kappa$ and $\mathbb{R}^\eta$ is projected (in this generic extension) onto $\mathbb{C}^\eta \restriction [\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))$.

Let us work, for a moment, in the generic extension by $\mathbb{P}^\eta$ (without $\mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho)$). In this model, $\mathrm{Col}(\rho^+, \mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa))$ is ρ^+-distributive: for every $\mu < \rho$ Mahlo cardinal, closed under f, one can subsume $\mathbb{P}$ by a product of μ.c.c. and μ-closed forcing notions. Therefore, in the generic extension $\mathrm{Col}(\rho^+, \mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa))$ is μ-distributive. This is true for cofinally many $\mu < \rho$ so $\mathrm{Col}(\rho^+, \mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa))$ is ρ-distributive. Since ρ is singular - it is ρ^+-distributive.

Therefore $\mathbb{R}^\eta$ is still ρ^+-closed in the generic extension by $\mathrm{Col}(\rho^+, \mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa))$. In this model, there is a generic filter for $\mathbb{A}^\eta_{[1,\omega\cdot n]} * \mathbb{C}^\eta \restriction \kappa$, and a continuous projection into the forcing notion $\mathbb{C}^\eta \restriction [\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))$. Note that $\mathbb{C}^\eta \restriction [\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa))$ is ρ^+-closed as well in this generic extension, by the same argument. We conclude that the quotient forcing $\mathbb{R}^\eta/(\mathbb{C}^\eta \restriction [\kappa, \mathrm{sc}_{\omega+2}(\kappa)))$, as defined in the generic extension by $\mathrm{Col}(\rho^+, \mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa))$ is ρ^+-closed.

Using 14, we conclude that this quotient forcing cannot add a branch to any ν^+-tree that was added by the only missing ingredient - $\mathrm{Col}(\omega, \rho)$.

Thus, it is enough to deal with the quotient forcing $\mathrm{Col}(\rho^+, \mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa))/(\mathbb{A}^\eta_{[1,\omega\cdot n]} * \mathbb{C}^\eta \restriction \kappa)$. This forcing has cardinality $\mathrm{sc}_1(\kappa)$. Since the other forcing notions do not collapse the cardinals $\mathrm{sc}_n(\kappa)$ for all $n < \omega$, by Lemma 9, it cannot add a branch to ν^+-tree. □

□

Combining the results so far, we have the following situation:

Lemma 37. *For every supercompact κ, there is $\rho < \kappa$ such that ρ is strong limit singular, closed under f, and for every sequence of cardinals $\rho = \kappa_0 < \kappa_1 < \cdots < \kappa_n = \kappa$, taking $\eta = \langle \kappa_i \mid i \leq n \rangle$, $\mathbb{P}^\eta$ forces the tree property at ν^+.*

The function that picks for every supercompact κ a cardinal ρ such that that $\mathbb{P}^\eta$ forces the tree property at $\mathrm{sc}_\omega(\kappa)$ is regressive. Since there are stationary many supercompact cardinals, by Fodor's lemma, there is a stationary subset of supercompact cardinals that share the same value of ρ, $\rho_\star$. Let $\langle \kappa_n \mid 1 \leq n < \omega \rangle$ be the first ω supercompact cardinals in this stationary set. Complete it to an ω-sequence $\langle \kappa_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ by taking κ_0 to be $\rho_\star$, and let $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}^\eta$.

Theorem 38. *In the generic extension by $\mathbb{P}^\eta$, the tree property holds in every successor cardinal between $\aleph_2$ and $\aleph_{\omega^2}$.*

Proof. The tree property at double successors is proved in Lemma 28. The tree property for successors of singulars is guranteed by the discussion above. □

References

1. Uri Abraham, *Aronszajn trees on $\aleph_2$ and $\aleph_3$*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **24** (1983), no. 3, 213–230. MR 717829 (85d:03100)
2. Yair Hayut and Mohammad Golshani, *Tree property at a countable segment of successors of singular cardinals*, In review.
3. Thomas Jech, *Set theory*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003, The third millennium edition, revised and expanded. MR 1940513
4. Menachem Magidor and Sharon Shelah, *The tree property at successors of singular*, Archive for Mathematical Logic (1996), 385–404.
5. William Mitchell, *Aronszajn trees and the independence of the transfer property*, Ann. Math. Logic **5** (1972/73), 21–46. MR 0313057
6. Itay Neeman, *The tree property up to $\aleph_{\omega+1}$*, J. Symb. Log. **79** (2014), no. 2, 429–459. MR 3224975

7. Dima Sinapova, *The tree property and the failure of the singular cardinal hypothesis at* $\aleph_{\omega^2}$, Journal of Simbolic Logic **77** (2012), 729–1056.
8. Spencer Unger, *Aronszajn trees and the successors of a singular cardinal*, Arch. Math. Logic **52** (2013), no. 5-6, 483–496. MR 3072773
9. ———, *The tree property below* $\aleph_{\omega \cdot 2}$, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **167** (2016), no. 3, 247–261. MR 3437646
10. Spencer Unger and Dima Sinapova, *The tree property at* $\aleph_{\omega^2+1}$ *and* $\aleph_{\omega^2+2}$, In review.